

REMARKS

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 – 37 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AS AMENDED IS IMPROPER

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the ‘326 Lincke Patent. In light of the amended claims, Applicant believes the present rejection is traversed and the patent allowable, because the claimed features cannot be found in the cited art reference. Accordingly, the Applicant believes the Examiner’s rejection based on the ‘326 Lincke Patent should be overcome.

The invention as amended uses registration messages to transmit and set up the public key for encrypting and decrypting information packets in the security associations between the home network and the foreign network. The secured transmissions also occur between AAA servers on the home and foreign networks so the AAA servers can track the secured transmissions. All of the encrypted information packets are routed through an AAA server using the security associations.

The ‘326 Lincke Patent does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of registration messages to exchange and set up public keys or the use of AAA servers for accounting of secured transmissions. Neither registration messages nor AAA servers are discussed in the ‘326 Lincke Patent. Because registration messages are not discussed or used to exchange public keys and AAA servers are not found in the ‘326 Lincke Patent, the cited prior art cannot support rejection of amended independent Claims 1, 11, 20, and 29. Because the dependent claims include all the limitations of the base independent claim, it is likewise believed that the dependent claims are allowable.

II. CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application because the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections is believed to have been traversed by the present Response. Independent Claims 1, 11, 20, and 29 as amended are believed allowable because the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all the claimed elements. Since the dependent claims add further limitations to the allowable independent claims, the Applicants believe the dependent claims are likewise allowable. Accordingly, pending claims 1-37 are believed allowable because the claimed invention is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited prior art.

It is believed that no additional fees are necessary for this filing. If additional fees are required for filing this response, then the appropriate fees should be deducted from D. Scott Hemingway's Deposit Account No. 501,270.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Scott Hemingway
Reg. No. 36,366
Attorney for Applicant

Storm & Hemingway, LLP
460 Preston Common West
8117 Preston Road
Dallas, Texas 75225
(214)292-8301 (voice)
(214)739-5209 (fax)